

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-3, 5 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuoka (US 6,263,120).

5 **Response:**

Claim 1

As recited by Matsuoka in col. 2, lines 41-53, “Another object of the present invention is to provide an image-data interpolation processing method that can ... **discriminate whether the area contains an edge-portion according to a mean value obtained for the domain and select a suitable interpolating method, whereby the discrete cosine transformation of image data can be easily done and the discrimination of edge-portion can be done without consideration of direction of the edge portion.**”

In addition, as recited by Matsuoka in col. 4, lines 42-52, “**The image discriminating step (STEP 4) discriminates the presence or absence of an edge-portion in the partial image ... The filter selecting step (STEP 5) selects either a bilinear interpolation filter or a cubic-convolution interpolation filter depending on whether the partial image contains or does not contain an edge portion (i.e., according to the discriminating result).** The image-data interpolating step (STEP 6) executes interpolation of the partial image data by using the selected filter.” Thus, the “**suitable interpolating method**” mentioned above is implemented by utilizing a filter selected from the “**bilinear interpolation filter**” and the “**cubic-convolution interpolation filter**”, where the former is utilized when “a partial image area is discriminated to an image not containing an edge-portion” (see col. 6, lines 38-52), and the latter is utilized when “An partial image is discriminated as an edge-containing image” (see col. 6, line 53 through col. 7, line 5).
25 Please note that Equation (13) is simply a matrix operation (see col. 6, line 61), so there is no interpolation direction that is flexibly determined and utilized for interpolating a pixel.

In regard to claim 1 of the present application, at least one inventive idea claimed in

Appl. No. 10/708,923
Amdt. dated July 12, 2007
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2007

claim 1 is different from Matsuoka, and is neither suggested nor taught by Matsuoka. As recited in Step (b) of claim 1 of the present application, “**if an edge is detected, determining an interpolation direction for the pixel according to the DCT data, and interpolating the pixel according to the interpolation direction.**” (*emphasis added*) Therefore, by

- 5 considering the method of claim 1 of the present application as a whole, Applicant believes that the obviousness rejection to claim 1 is improper. Reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-13

Claims 2-13 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found
10 allowable.

Claim 14

In light of above statements under Claim 1, Applicant asserts that the claimed features of claim 14 are not obvious, with respect to Matsuoka. Reconsideration of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

15 Claims 15-20

Claims 15-20 are dependent on claim 14, and should be allowed if claim 14 is found allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

20 Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the allowance of claims 4, 6-12 and 17-20.

Conclusion:

Thus, all pending claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance with respect to the cited art for at least the reasons presented above. Applicant respectfully requests that a
25 timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/708,923
Amdt. dated July 12, 2007
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2007

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 07.12.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.
is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)